

March 16, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

5793

Educators sometimes lose sight of the body in their enthusiasm to develop the mind. A brilliant mind in a dead body isn't worth much.

In order to insure healthy minds and bodies to all Americans, I urge you to consider the expansion of the National Defense Education Act to include health, physical education, and recreation. UN

## STEADY COURSE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. ADAMS (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers are frequently filled with doubts and questions about what this country is accomplishing in Vietnam. Because the President very properly refuses to stir up false optimism, there are many who mistakenly believe that we are making no progress at all.

This morning's Herald Tribune carried a Washington column by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, one of America's most distinguished journalists, which should be read by all those who are concerned with Asia. In a few succinct paragraphs, Mr. Drummond makes it clear that the firm stand we have taken in Vietnam has had repercussions throughout Asia during the past 12 months—all of them advantageous to the free world:

LAOS, CAMBODIA CITED: U.S. CAUSE ON OTHER FRONTS ADVANCED BY VIET SHOWING  
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—One thing the American people do not want about Vietnam is false optimism. We know the road ahead will be anxious and painful.

But since it became clear that the United States is prepared to stay the course in Vietnam, there have been heartening dividends.

What has happened during the past year following the strong stand—and successful battles—by the United States and South Vietnam?

The evidence is showing up in many nations in Asia and the far Pacific. When you add them up, they begin to show how significantly events have begun to move during the very period the once imminent Vietcong victory has been moving further away from their reach.

The record tells its own story:

Laos: Twelve months ago the Latolian Communists were a mounting peril to the Government. Today they are badly splintered.

Cambodia: Twelve months ago it seemed that Prince Sihanouk was trying to win merit points with the Communists as a hedge against the future. Today he is warning his own people that, if North Vietnam prevails, they can expect no mercy from their own Communist Party.

Philippines: Twelve months ago the Philippines were racked with riots in protest against even the small support the Government was giving to Saigon. Now the Government is preparing to send troops.

Korea: Twelve months ago Korea had contributed only token forces to the defense of South Vietnam. Now it is at the point of bringing the total of its combat troops there to 44,000—more, in proportion to its population of 28,500,000, than the United States itself.

Peiping-Moscow: 12 months ago the American and foreign critics of U.S. policy in Vietnam were in unanimous chorus declaring that one consequence of the U.S. decision to defend South Vietnam was bound to happen:

it would end the Sino-Soviet feud and drive Moscow and Peiping back into each other's arms. It did just the opposite.

Japan: 12 months ago Japan was moving toward a new *modus vivendi* with Red China and was the center of harsh criticism of U.S. policy. Today the Japanese Government is helping to focus world pressure on Hanoi to accept peace talks.

Indonesia: 12 months ago the unpredictable Sukarno held total sway; he was surrounded by pro-Communist associates and buttressed by the third largest Communist Party in the world. Indonesian policy was pro-Red China and anti-Western.

Today Indonesian policy is anti-Red China and less anti-Western. The Indonesian Communist Party is no more. Sukarno has either lost most of his power to the anti-Communist leaders of the army—or all of it.

And on top of these events, not a single dissident South Vietnamese political leader who left Saigon for involuntary exile in protest against past regimes has given his support to the Vietcong.

I am not suggesting that the overturn in Indonesia or that all of the other events stem directly from the strong U.S. stand in Vietnam. That is honestly arguable. What I believe is not arguable is that the evident will of the United States to stay the course in Vietnam made these heartening dividends more attainable.

## SUGAR INDUSTRY IN HAWAII SHOWS FURTHER GAINS

(Mr. MATSUNAGA was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the solid foundations on which Hawaii's economy rests is its durable sugar industry. It is therefore with pride and satisfaction that I call the attention of Congress to the state of robust health of our island State's major industry.

In the year 1965 Hawaii registered an alltime record in per-acre sugar production. Exceeding the 1964 figure by almost half a ton, the 1965 sugar production was a record 11.11 tons per acre. This record tonnage exceeds the previous record of 10.84 tons per acre which was set in 1955. One sugar company on the island of Kauai recorded the highest figure ever registered by any plantation with 14.99 tons per acre.

Although comparable 1965 figures for the other domestic areas are not yet available, a cursory comparison with the official 1964 figures of the U.S. Department of Agriculture puts Hawaii well ahead of any other domestic sugar producing area. Louisiana produced 1.76 tons per acre; Florida, 2.61 tons; Puerto Rico, 3.26 tons; and the beet area, 2.38 tons. Since Hawaii's crop takes 2 years to mature, while the others mature in 1 year, the Hawaiian figure should be cut in half for fair comparison. Even then, Hawaii still leads in per-acre sugar production. Hawaii's producers deserve national recognition.

## MSGR. ANTHONY DiLUCA

(Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last

week back in my district a joyous triple anniversary was observed, as the beloved pastor of the Holy Family parish of Nutley, Msgr. Anthony DiLuca, celebrated the 60th year of his ordination as a priest, the 33d year of his service to the communities of Belleville-Nutley and his 85th birthday.

Like so many of all faiths of northern New Jersey, I have been privileged to know the monsignor for many, many years. And though his principal work has been devoted to our Lord and the people of his parish, his wise counsel on all matters has so often been sought by men of all creeds. As the editor and publisher of the Nutley Sun, Frank Orechio, stated in an editorial in the current edition of his fine paper, the communities the monsignor "has served so well express their gratitude to one of God's greatest servants."

There is little I can add to Mr. Orechio's editorial accolade. Only the prayer that we may continue to be blessed with Monsignor DiLuca's presence among us for many years to come.

The editorial follows:

MSGR. ANTHONY DiLUCA

The high calling of the priesthood is reserved for very few persons in this world. No greater privilege or blessing can God bestow upon mortal man.

The person thus chosen must possess unique attributes. He can be no ordinary man. Personal sacrifice is the order of the day for a priest.

Sixty years ago, there came to the priesthood in Italy a young man aged 25 whose eager face and hopeful eyes reflected the indomitable spirit of a later-day Christopher Columbus.

Anthony DiLuca, the boy, became Father Anthony DiLuca, never realizing that his deeds on earth were to exceed his childhood's fondest dreams.

A more humble man never walked this earth or wore the priest's collar.

His love of God and church is equaled only by his dedication to the people he serves.

In time the fantastic accomplishments of Father DiLuca, who took over a poor and insignificant "Italian" parish in 1933, came to the attention of the Vatican.

And to the gentle man who developed the "Miracle of Brookline Avenue" came the high honor of elevation to monsignor.

In the 33 years that we of the Nutley-Belleville area have enjoyed the special privilege of Monsignor DiLuca's friendship, inspiring leadership, and companionship, his holy family church complex has become one of the most outstanding parishes in the American branch of the Roman Catholic Church.

As Monsignor DiLuca relaxes to meditate upon his fruitful 85 years this Saturday, the communities he has served so well express their gratitude to one of God's greatest servants. Nutley and Belleville are better communities—because men like Monsignor DiLuca have walked among us.

## HUNGARIAN FREEDOM DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, March 16 is a date held dear by all our friends of Hungarian birth or descent. This day marks the 117th anniversary of Hungary's overthrow of the Hapsburg rule in 1849.

This anniversary has significance to all of us whether of Hungarian descent or not, because it reminds us of one of the great 19th century struggles for the type of freedom which America had long enjoyed and cherished. It is important to us because of the almost superhuman fight which a small band of liberty-loving Hungarian patriots waged against the powerful Hapsburg forces.

We read with deep emotion the story of Hungary's dramatic emergence as an independent nation after long centuries of rule by the Turks and Austrians. We are thrilled with the exploits of the young leader of the revolution, Louis Kossuth, who had dedicated his life to bringing independence to his country.

It is with sadness and regret that we are reminded that the coveted independence so loudly acclaimed by the world and so joyfully accepted by the Hungarian people was to be of such short duration.

For it was only a matter of a few short months before the Hapsburgs with the strong help of Russian troops defeated the defenders of the infant Republic. When this tragic blow struck, Kossuth and the other leaders of the new Government were forced to flee. In spite of their efforts while in exile, they could not summon sufficient strength to re-establish the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian people have been suffering a more recent tragedy as grave as that which faced them in 1849. Almost a hundred years later the same powerful Russians who helped them lose their republic, imposed a new form of subjugation and enslavement as they became a part of the area behind the curtain of iron lowered by the Russian Communist leadership. It was these same Russians who moved in with tanks and superior forces of men and guns to quell the short revolt of 1956.

This day commemorating the Independence of Hungary should remind us that the mothers and fathers, the brothers and sisters, the friends and relatives alike of thousands of our loyal American citizens still suffer the privations and loss of dignity resulting from Soviet domination and Communist control.

This important date should remind us, too, of the debt we owe our American citizens who are so proud of their Hungarian blood and heritage.

Their gifts of art, of music, and of drama are only a part of the magnificent contribution they have made to America. Because of these gifts, Americans must not cease in continuing every effort to bring to the people of Hungary a full realization of our love and admiration, and an assurance of our determination to do all in our power to restore the blessings of freedom to them.

#### TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] concerning the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, made in the Committee of the Whole, may be printed in

the Record immediately following the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### BYPASSING THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EMPLOYMENT SECURITY: A STUDY IN OBTAINING CONSENSUS

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks elsewhere in the body of the Record and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the Lengthy Ways and Means Committee hearings on the administration's bill to amend the unemployment compensation program (H.R. 8282) in August 1965, the Labor Secretary's misuse of proper procedures for administering the employment security program became evident. Under cross-examination it was made clear that the Labor Secretary had not consulted the organization—the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security—established by the 1933 Wagner-Peyser Act, and subsequent departmental reorganization, in making his Department's radical changes in the unemployment security program embodied in H.R. 8282. The Federal Advisory Council was established to insure that those who are affected by the unemployment compensation laws—labor, business, and the public at large—were also consulted both in administering and improving the laws. Thus the Council was established to make certain that the laws met the needs of the people they affect. The Federal Advisory Council has been prevented from performing this necessary and valuable function. The full Advisory Council has met only once since October 1963. This last meeting was held on January 5-6, 1966. At this meeting H.R. 8282 was discussed, but there was no formal resolution or action of any kind.

The Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933—section 11(a)—provides for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security, and for State advisory councils. The function and organization of the Federal Advisory Council is not spelled out in the Wagner-Peyser Act, nor do the hearings on the Wagner-Peyser Act and the reports of the Senate and House committees express the intent of Congress in providing for the Council. But Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949 clearly assigns to the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security the responsibility of advising on the coordination and administration of the employment security program.

A clear precedent for the function and organization of the Federal Advisory Council is provided by the Labor Department's published guidelines for State advisory councils. These Labor Department guidelines specify both the function and organization of State advisory councils:

##### Function:

(a) The Federal guidelines provide that, in general, the functions of the Advisory Council should be to advise the administrative

agency in formulating policies, in getting public understanding of the employment security program, and in insuring impartiality, neutrality, and freedom from political influence in the establishment and implementation of employment security policies.

(b) Among the specific functions of the State advisory councils is the requirement that they advise the State employment security agency in developing or revising policies in connection with the administration of the State unemployment insurance laws; also, to assist the State agency in developing a legislative program for improving the State unemployment compensation law to encourage acceptance by the State government of such a program and to cooperate with the State agency in promoting greater understanding and acceptance of the program by the public.

##### Organization:

(a) The Federal guidelines state that members of State advisory councils should be appointed for 2 years and that one-half of the council should be appointed each year.

(b) The guidelines state that the advisory councils should have regular meeting dates and should meet at least twice a year.

The Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security has begun non-compliance proceedings in specific instances where the composition of the State councils was felt to be improper. In other cases, where advisory councils were assumed to be not properly used by the States, informal pressures have been applied to secure compliance.

The Labor Department guidelines for State employment security advisory councils are a sound basis for evaluating the Labor Department's conduct of its official Federal Advisory Council.

The Labor Department's use of its own Advisory Council is deficient in the following respects when measured against the Labor Department's requirements of the States:

First. The full Federal Advisory Council has not met between October 24, 1963, and January 5, 1966. Its Committee on Employment Service met last on May 11, 1964. This means that the Council had no part in preparing H.R. 8282.

Second. As of the Ways and Means hearings on H.R. 8282 in August 1965, 12 seats on the Federal Advisory Council were vacant out of a total of 26. When the terms of five business, four labor, and three public members ended last June 1965, new members were not appointed. Since August 1965 one business representative has been appointed to the Council.

Third. And most important, the Federal Advisory Council was not consulted in the formulation of H.R. 8282. The meeting in January 1966 was held after the fact, and no recommendations were made to the Labor Department. Members of the Federal Advisory Council have stated that they were never asked to consider H.R. 8282.

The last point should be explored. When asked at the Ways and Means hearings why H.R. 8282 contained a provision for a new advisory committee when the existing one had not been used, Secretary Wirtz answered:

I have found it, working with that committee, almost impossible to get away from the expression of straight institutional points of view.

March 16, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1491

The reporter stumbled over a rusty wash-tub on the porch and trudged back across the field.

## PEOPLE WON'T TALK ABOUT POVERTY

There are no built-in service organizations in rural areas as there are in the cities for poverty fighters to work through. The people themselves resist organization.

The poor might attend a meeting in their Detroit or Chicago neighborhoods. But try to get them together to talk about poverty in a valley in Appalachia.

One of the rural community action programs is in Grayson in northeast Kentucky. It serves the six counties of Carter, Elliott, Greenup, Lewis, Morgan, and Rowan. Morgan and Elliott are among the 82 counties listed by President Johnson as the poorest in the country. In the 6-county area there are 93,364 persons. Of these, 10,668 are poor according to the standards of the poverty war. In Elliott 64 percent are poor and in Morgan the figure is 67.

The houses, many of them never more than shacks, have gone to seed.

Most of the families have lived there for generations. Some of the farms were once fair-size units, providing a good life in days when the small farmer could make a decent living on a few crops.

But the farms have been split up from generation to generation, with descendants of the original owners each year getting smaller and smaller pieces.

The antipoverty project in the area was funded for \$198,000. The director, Lee Taylor who has an independent income from a number of Kentucky oil wells, is paid an annual salary of \$12,000.

## HOW TO COOK SURPLUS FOOD

One of the programs is to teach recipients of surplus food how to make it palatable. Another involves busing poor youths who have demonstrated ability to a nearby junior college. There are 19 in the program.

As in the urban community action programs, there are paid doorbell ringers who go out to enlist the poor in self-help programs, most of which are not really set up, and try to get them interested in doing things for themselves.

The rural poor are suspicious of such goings-on.

And, in some cases, so is Taylor. He discovered that nearly 20 of about 30 so-called subprofessional aid jobs in one county went to Democratic precinct workers. The pay is about \$300 a month and the idea is to involve the poor themselves.

Taylor says most of the politically appointed aids have been fired. But there are similar stories in other anti-poverty programs where politicians find handy machinery for patronage.

It is far more the exception than the rule, however.

## GOOD EXAMPLE HARDLY WORKS

Washington officials describe the Grayson operation as a "good example" of how a rural program works. Actually, at least so far, it is scarcely working at all.

And, according to Taylor, not a single representative of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which runs the war on poverty, has been there to have a look.

"Hell," he said, "most of those people up in Washington haven't any idea of what rural area looks like outside of a golf course."

And he complains that the whole war is "urban oriented."

What does Taylor think about the possibility of success in the rural programs?

"I have grave doubts," he said.

One program popular in Kentucky and other rural areas has earned the nickname of "Happy Pappies."

Technically they are called Work Experience and Training Programs and they provide direct payments in poverty funds to unemployed fathers up to \$250 a month.

## SOME 23,483 BECOME HAPPY PAPPIES

To be eligible, a man must be out of work for 90 days, willing and registered to work, not eligible for unemployment compensation and have at least one child.

This year there are 59 approved projects for 23,483 persons at a cost of \$44 million.

Taylor uses Happy Pappies in his program. "Let's say I want some Happy Pappies for a few days," he says. I call Judge Roy Brown in Elliott County and the Happy Pappies appear for work."

Why does Taylor telephone the county judge, really an exalted justice of the peace in the Kentucky system?

"That's just the way you do it," says Taylor.

The judges, elected officials, have the job of certifying people as poor in Kentucky. So apparently they are used because they know who the poor are. And, in the county system, the judge is an important political figure, who, among other things, runs the county highway department.

What do the Happy Pappies do?

In one case, Taylor said they fixed up a room in a dilapidated house as a demonstration project to show "what a few dollars worth of paint can do."

What do the people in the area think, including the Happy Pappies?

"It's all political and the politicians run it."

## RACE HOLDS UP PROGRAM SOME

In many areas the South is shortchanging itself, especially in connection with rural programs, by failing to set up antipoverty. Race is often a big factor, since involving the poor is tantamount to involving Negroes.

One of the most hopeful programs in the Deep South is just getting underway in Mississippi. It is called STAR (systematic training and redevelopment program) and is a child of the Catholic Church. It is a statewide program aimed at jobs, job training, and adult education. With headquarters in Jackson, the board has achieved outstanding racial balance.

In Mississippi, 48 percent of all the citizens over 25 have only an eighth-grade education or less. Four percent have never been to school. And 160,000 have less than a fourth-grade education.

Negroes, it is turning out, are more eager to participate in the education programs than whites. And herein lies a major problem. The illiterate and semilliterate whites are reluctant to go to classes with Negroes.

"But it is improving all the time" says Father Lawrence Watts, who the Natchez-Jackson diocese has assigned to the project full time.

There are other antipoverty programs for the rural areas—like loans to poor farmers to buy simple things like mules and machinery with which to form cooperatives.

But, in the end, the problems of the rural areas—with poverty often concealed by landscape and pride—might be the hardest to solve. There may not be a solution.

Few, however, are able to look at the children who are growing up dirty and neglected in an increasingly complicated and urban society and deny that some kind of effort should be made.

## The Northern Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the readers of the RECORD will be

extremely interested in Joseph Alsop's latest column on the Vietnam situation in which he discusses recommendations made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. His article "The Northern Bombing," published in the Washington Post of March 16, follows:

## THE NORTHERN BOMBING

(By Joseph Alsop)

The cat is out of the bag. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been publicly revealed as pressing the President to intensify the bombing of North Vietnam still further, and especially to permit the destruction of the vital North Vietnamese oil fuel stores.

As usual in Lyndon Johnson's Washington, the whole problem of the northern bombing has been muddled and obscured as much as possible. So it may be as well to remove some of the muddle before analyzing the Joint Chiefs' recommendation.

To begin with, when the peace offensive and bombing pause came to an end, there was a report that the permitted bombing area in the north was much more limited, by the President's order, than it had been before the pause began. The report was officially denied. But it was also used as a lever for a spate of other reports that the President's post-pause policy was to "limit the war," which were not denied.

The realities behind all this were quite different from the public appearance. First, the military planners in both Washington and Saigon believed that the highest priority immediately postpause, should be given to bombing the bridges and other useful targets on the lines of communication directly feeding the Ho Chi Minh trail. These are in the most southerly provinces of North Vietnam. And in this manner, the initial bombing area was in fact temporarily restricted.

Second, however, far from "limiting" our effort against the north, the President has already authorized a major intensification. The approved sortie rate—the number of missions flown against northern targets—was tripled after the pause ended. Weather permitting, therefore, we are now dropping three times as many bombs on northern targets as we did prepause.

This earlier decision to triple the weight of bombing points, of course, toward just the kind of further intensification that the Joint Chiefs are now pressing on the President. Two things stand in the way.

One is the fact that the biggest fuel depot in North Vietnam is in the outskirts of Haiphong, and the second biggest is in the outskirts of Hanoi. The other is a hand-tailored intelligence analysis concluding that the truck movement over the Ho Chi Minh trail would not be seriously hampered, even if all the fuel depots in North Vietnam were completely destroyed.

The analysis in question rouses the unavoidable suspicion that its preparation was somehow linked to the President's invariable hankering to conserve what he calls his "options"—in this case the option of not bombing in the Hanoi and Haiphong areas. At any rate, those who reached the conclusion summarized above must clearly have been taking lessons from Alice in Wonderland's chum, the White Queen, who proudly boasted that she had often managed to "believe six impossible things before breakfast."

Notwithstanding the analysis, it is clear that the President will eventually discover he has no option whatever, except to follow the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs. The facts leave him none, and it is a bit shocking that the facts have not been faced and the key decision has not yet been taken.

Briefly, the revised intelligence estimates that caused such a panic in Washington and produced the vaudeville peace offensive, predict a buildup of enemy regular units in South Vietnam to a level equivalent to no less than 18 divisions. The estimates also predict a rise in deliveries over the Ho Chi

A1492

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 16, 1966

Minh trail to a level well above 6,000 tons a month.

The latter is the key figure in the estimates, for without tonnage coming in to sustain them, the addition of new enemy regular forces in the south would actually be counterproductive. Given the character of the Ho Chi Minh trail, the character of the terrain it traverses, and the distances that have to be covered, a huge truck movement, involving 2,000 or 3,000 vehicles, will be needed to lay down 6,000 tons monthly in South Vietnam.

Ammunition to be used against our troops will be the most important commodity carried by those trucks. How then can the President refrain from doing everything in his power to halt or at least to greatly diminish the truck movement?

For the need is most emphatically not for area bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. The need is for pinpoint bombing to destroy the fuel depots in the outskirts of these cities and elsewhere in North Vietnam. It is a purely military need.

The President constantly proclaims his worry about "pressure from the hawks." He ought instead to welcome a public demand to get on with the war by doing what needs doing. And in this case, he will surely have to do what needs doing in the end.

### The War on Poverty: Boon or Boondoggle—No. 8

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, the eighth article of a series on poverty written by Washington reporter of the Detroit News, Tom Joyce, follows:

[From the Detroit News, Mar. 7, 1966]  
AMERICA'S CULTURALLY DEPRIVED—TROOPS IN POVERTY WAR SAVE A LOST GENERATION  
(By Tom Joyce)

WASHINGTON, March 7.—Poverty leaves its deepest scars on little children.

If there was ever any doubt about this, it was dispelled last summer when hundreds of thousands of preschool youngsters between 4 and 5 from poverty's streets embarked on a new and exciting experience.

It was Project Headstart, an experiment that has won much praise and very little criticism.

The idea was to give culturally deprived children from poor homes—the youngsters who begin school under a frightful handicap—a better chance by providing preschool experience.

The program, which is now becoming a major part of the war against poverty, did much more than this. It provided a deep—and often disturbing—insight into the children who come from the slums, the ghettos and the country shacks of America.

#### SHOCKING NEGLECT

It has been known for years that these children, the 4-, 5-, and 6-year-olds, start school with anything but an equal chance for success.

The extent of the cultural neglect was shocking, even to educators who long had known of its existence. In thousands of cases, medical neglect was even more disturbing.

A child who had never spoken a word, presumed to be mentally deficient, did not talk

because he could not hear. And he did not hear because of massive deposits of wax in his ears. He had never been taken to a doctor, despite the suspicion of mental abnormality.

In Tampa, Fla., nearly 10 percent of the children enrolled in a Headstart program had eye defects. About 50 percent suffered nutritional deficiencies. In Jacksonville, Fla., 52 percent were anemic.

In Detroit, examinations disclosed that out of 6,000 children, 80 percent required dental care.

#### THE DROPOUTS

It is among the children of the poor, who start school behind their classmates and keep getting farther behind, that there are so many school dropouts.

They are the children, like the millions of young men and women of today, who will be the out-of-school, out-of-work youngsters of tomorrow.

The Job Corps is finding out a lot about them. And much of the failure is being traced back to the handicap with which they began school, in first grade and kindergarten.

It is not so surprising when you look at some of the things discovered in Head Start.

A little girl in Georgia arrived at the classroom with only 20 words in her vocabulary. Simple symbols—at least simple in middle-class terms—had no meaning to her.

The minds of most American youngsters respond almost immediately to allusions from Mother Goose.

But the little girl in Atlanta had never heard a nursery rhyme. Maybe nobody had bothered to tell her. Maybe nobody in her little circle knew one to tell.

#### A HANDICAP

Other children in her class affectionately hugged picture books, the kind that are under beds and stacked in closets of most homes. But they had never had one before.

It is much like the experiences learned in Prince Edward County, Va., where the public schools were closed for 5 years to avoid segregation. Children from sharecropper families there could not understand even the simplest picture books.

A 9-year-old boy who had never been to class until the Federal Government forced Prince Edward to reopen public schools, looked at pictures in a book and stared blankly. One of the pictures was of a pair of galoshes. The word was written underneath. But he had never seen a pair of galoshes so neither the picture nor the word had any meaning.

The case of the little girl in Atlanta was not an isolated one. Dr. Curtis Henson, coordinator of Atlanta's Metropolitan School Council, discovered many cases where children entering the program had vocabularies limited to 20 and 30 words. How do they communicate? By making sounds and pointing to objects. In frustration, they hit and kick.

Beyond this, in Atlanta, Chicago, Los Angeles and almost everywhere where there was a Headstart program, it was discovered that many of the children did not know how to live in a world in which adults participated.

#### LEFT ALONE

A lot of them simply had been left alone, among other children, to make their own way.

This reporter stopped inside dozens of such homes across the country. The scene repeats itself. A hopeless mother is surrounded by 4, 5, 6, or even 10 children in a crowded tenement. She is present, but not in spirit. The children have no toys or books or games. They do not learn to sing songs.

When they are hungry, they eat, if there is any food. When they are tired, they go to bed, if there are enough beds.

They have no direction and their world is a negative one in which the word "no"

is the one most often heard. No one ever says, "Johnny, would you like to hear the story of the 'Three Bears'?"

#### PRaise PROGRAM

It is usually, "Johnny, shut up," or "Johnny, don't do that."

These children are not prepared for a world in which adults really take a part in their lives, and where they are asked to participate in decisionmaking processes.

In one Headstart class the children were asked:

"Do you want to have your picture taken?"

"No," they shouted in a loud chorus. But when they were told they were going to have their pictures taken, they screamed with delight.

School officials everywhere are singing the praises of Headstart.

And last fall, when the first children of the experiment headed into first grade, public school teachers reported that they "just couldn't believe the difference."

The poor children, based on experience with similar groups over a number of years, were said to be as much as 90 days ahead. And a lot of them were ready to begin school with something closer to an equal opportunity.

The summer program was a crash one. And the emphasis was on considerable individual attention. For the 561,000 children, there were 41,000 teachers, averaging out to 1 teacher for every 14 youngsters.

In addition, there were paid teacher aids and many volunteers, including teenagers, who helped with the serving of meals and the setting up of classrooms. Many of these were themselves poor.

In communities all over the Nation permanent Headstart programs have either begun or are now being planned.

#### REACH PARENTS

Among other things, the programs are turning up new ways to reach parents, many of whom distrust the schools as symbols of their own past failures. Now mothers are assisting in class and fathers are helping to prepare buildings and classrooms.

Many educators see Headstart as a possible way of getting adults involved in educational programs to improve their lives and their potentials.

Despite its achievements and its praise, Headstart was not spared its share of controversy in a war that rings with dispute and challenge. In some cases the South was a problem spot because of the traditional resistance to segregated school programs.

There was trouble in Mississippi. Senator JOHN STENNIS charged that Headstart funds were used to rescue civil rights demonstrators from jail. Nevertheless, the Office of Economic Opportunity only a few days ago approved a new \$5.6 million grant to Mississippi for a 6-month program for 9,135 children. Last month a group from the State brought preschool children to Washington to protest delays in granting the funds.

#### FUNDS DELAYED

In some other southern areas funds were withheld, causing loud protestations, because Washington officials did not think local leaders really tried hard enough to solve segregation problems.

And, as in most large-scale program where large amounts of Federal money is involved, there were abuses.

Under the original plan, up to 25 percent of the preschool children in programs could be from outside the ranks of the poor. The idea was to give culturally deprived children a chance to have associations with youngsters from better families. Experts and school officials generally believe this was an excellent idea.

But because of pressure, in many cases resulting from abuses, the figure has been reduced to 10 percent.

March 16, 1966

A1505

Fifth. Training and guidance of guerrillas to invade America.

Sixth. Creation of a committee to assist and aid the Vietcong. The very same Vietcong whom some sympathizers in the United States wish to include in the Vietnam Government—a proposal which Vice President HUMPHREY has likened to putting a fox in the chicken coop.

#### OAS GIVES WEAK PROTEST

The importance of these resolutions is confirmed in statements made by the delegates from different countries, among them Pedro Medina of Venezuela, who urged co-ordination of guerrilla movements to achieve broader support. The Vietnamese representative expressed himself in these terms: "One Yankee killed in Vietnam is one Yankee less that our Venezuelan brothers will have to kill in Venezuela." The Chilean Communist Party president stated harmonized activity to be the only way to attain power.

The OAS has limited itself to an academic protest against the Tricontinental Conference which is a flagrant violation of the principles and purposes of the U.N. Charter and a General Assembly declaration voted by 109 member States.

#### CHALLENGES NOT MET

It is time to admit openly that the Havana tricontinental meeting accords are a formal declaration of war, a subversive war; like those being everywhere financed by the Soviet Union and Red China.

Castro's regime has recognized the Vietcong and Puerto Rico as free countries. Narciso Rabel Martinez, a Communist Puerto Rican leader, has been appointed ambassador to Cuba although Puerto Rico is politically tied to the United States. This is another challenge that has not been contested.

At the time of the missile crisis in 1962, President Kennedy committed himself with Prime Minister Khrushchev not to invade Cuba, and not to allow Cuba to be invaded. This agreement has made Cuba a Communist sanctuary. It permits Castro to operate freely, secure in the knowledge that it is not possible to develop a Cuban counter-revolution in the United States which would liberate Cuba from communism and free Latin America and the United States from its threat.

In contrast, Washington, D.C., has denied us free Cubans establishment of a Cuban government-in-exile, or any other official status, which would lend moral support to our efforts to rescue our fatherland.

#### LOOMING THREAT

Even if we disregard inter-American treaties, a nonintervention policy at this times is not fair or intelligent if it leaves the Latin American peoples at the mercy of Communist infiltration.

If Castro and the Communists stay in Cuba exporting their revolution, the downfall of other governments and nations of Latin America will be only a matter of time.

Thousands of Latin Americans are being trained every year in Havana, Moscow, Peking, and Prague in the techniques of sabotage, terrorism, and revolution.

The potential chaos cannot be suppressed indefinitely by the armed forces of Latin American countries, nor can their economies afford it. The cost to the United States of the Vietnam guerrilla war is more than the combined budgets of all Latin American countries.

It is impossible for me to understand the present U.S. position on a Communist Cuba under Fidel Castro. If the United States felt justified in throwing its weight against the Batista regime, it now would seem to be a matter of simple self-preservation to eliminate this cancer that is spreading throughout the hemisphere—not to mention American commitments under the inter-American juridical system and the Monroe Doctrine.

#### COMMITMENTS TO LATIN AMERICA

If the bombing of North Vietnam by American planes has not provoked a war with Red China or the Soviet Union, it is extremely unlikely any military action against Cuba would bring about such as conflict. The longer we delay elimination of Castro and his comrades, the greater the damage they can do.

If the United States is now carrying out in Vietnam the commitments it assumed under the treaty signed to defend southeast Asia, is it not equally bound to take similar action regarding Cuba—by the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, the Declaration of Caracas, the Declaration of the American Foreign Ministers' meeting held in Washington in 1964, and the Monroe Doctrine?

We may be taking the first steps toward a more constructive policy with relation to Communist Cuba: I refer to the September 20, 1965, resolution voted 312 to 52 in the U.S. Congress, which endorses the unilateral use of force by the United States, or any other Western Hemisphere country, to prevent a Communist takeover anywhere in this hemisphere.

The nations of Latin America want to align themselves solidly against their common enemy, communism—but they look to the United States for leadership. Resolutions of this sort—while perhaps not very important inside the United States—are extremely important internationally.

If the United States vacillates in the face of the intensified subversion which will result from the Tricontinental Conference, Latin America will vacillate too—and the subversion will bear its bitter fruit in bloodshed and toppled governments. If the United States stands firm—so will Latin America stand firm—and the plans of the Tricontinental Conference will be thwarted.

#### ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. (J. C. Russell.) Cuban refugees wish to return to Cuba, or remain in the United States? Answer. Hope to get back—have to think of those left behind.

Question. (R. T. Durbrow.) Cuban Electric Co. assets all lost to Castro? Answer. Yes.

Question. (John Brickley.) Was Castro a Communist before gaining power, or was his coming into power a result of nonrecognition of him by the United States? Answer. Castro was Communist before, and ample proof exists; 1948—Communists planned riots in Bogota, Colombia, thousands killed, \$30 million damage. Castro was active there. He was caught in a radio station inciting people to riot. He was jailed and saved by Cuban ambassador to United States; 1955—Castro jailed again, but released in general amnesty. Went to Mexico to train guerrillas, Raul, Castro's brother, was trained in Moscow. Castro created a secret state police and declared he's a Marxist-Leninist.

Question. (C. J. Gray.) Missiles now being installed?

Answer. No proof. Have only information from U-2 planes which don't show up what is on ground. Soviets sending tons of concrete into areas where no Cuban is allowed. At a gate the Cuban truck drivers turn over their trucks to Russians who drive off, return with empty trucks, turn them back to the Cubans.

Question. (Dr. Ed Williams.) Cuba's future relations with Soviet Union and Red China?

Answer. At Tricontinental Conference both Soviet Union and Red China represented—both agree on course of action.

Question. (C. M. Avery.) Would Batista have supported democratic elections with U.S. support?

Answer. Main reason why people hated Batista—no political freedom. Also tremendous graft in government circles. Tremendous propaganda built up for Castro in United States. None of the information furnished the U.S. State Department as to

Castro's Communist ties ever reached either Secretary of State or the President. Such information never got above the fourth floor of State Department.

Question. (R. Cathcart.) Castro sending agents to United States among refugees?

Answer. Of course. Offer no harm to security of United States. He may have a group give a show—for propaganda purposes—asserting they want to go back to Communist Cuba.

Question. Best course of action against Communist Cuba?

Answer. First, a completely enforced embargo. All nations should respect that embargo. (Remember, the United States backs a Rhodesian embargo.) Second, help the Cubans—give support. Third, coordinate efforts of hemisphere. Only United States can provide needed hemispheric leadership.

#### President's Vietnam Policy Supported by Representative Bob Casey

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ELIGIO DE LA GARZA**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the President's policy in handling the crisis in Vietnam and southeast Asia. This is one of the most difficult problems in foreign policy our Nation has faced, and some of us believe the handful of critics have been given undue attention by the press.

Many of my colleagues have repeatedly expressed full support of our President's policy, but rarely does it get more than local attention. Because I feel the American people, and in particular my colleagues in Congress, should know that most of us have great confidence in our President, and stand with him on the difficult decisions he has had to make, it is my pleasure to bring to your attention the report of a speech made by my friend and colleague, Representative Bob CASEY, before the Houston Optimist Club.

The report is from the Southwestern Argus of March 3, 1966:

#### BOB CASEY STANDS WITH L.B.J.

Congressman BOB CASEY, who visited Vietnam in November, said in Houston Thursday that President Johnson's war policy has his full support.

CASEY was sharply critical of recent attacks in Washington on our policy in Vietnam.

Speaking before the Houston Optimist Club in the Rice Hotel, CASEY called the war "one of the dirtiest wars and also one of the most vital we have ever fought."

"I have often differed with the President, but I am in full accord with his Vietnam policy," CASEY said.

"The criticism in Washington adds fuel to the fires of criticism at home—the talk of withdrawal appeals to the mother whose son is about to go to Vietnam and to those who would have us withdraw into a shell."

CASEY said he had recently received a letter from a constituent, a woman, "who wanted to know what we are doing over there, why we don't pull out and why does the President refuse to sit down at the conference table."



A1506

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 16, 1966

"She and others like her are ignoring the President's every effort to mediate the war, including the cessation of bombing, the many emissaries he has sent all over the world and his repeated invitations to the Vietcong to meet us at the conference table," the Congressman said.

"This lady is willing to take the word of three men who, against the laws of this country, visited Hanoi and came back as mouthpieces for the Communists. She is willing to take their word against that of the President of the United States.

"Let's consider what would happen if we did pull out.

"The coalition Government in South Vietnam would fall almost immediately; the Vietcong would take over and reap revenge on every man who opposed them. You would see the worst blood bath in modern history.

"Our presence in Vietnam encourages other Asian nations.

"Other countries, not as advanced as ourselves, gain encouragement to take on a more democratic government.

"We may not live to see it, but in time our sacrifices will bear fruit."

Congressman CASEY said that he is sure that President Johnson is sensitive to the loss of American lives in the war, "more than any of us, I imagine, because he has to make the decision to send our boys over there."

"It would be easy for the President to dodge this grave responsibility and leave the problem for the next President," CASEY said.

"But with leadership comes responsibility—I don't envy the President."

Under unanimous consent, it is my pleasure to insert Miss Schneider's letter in the RECORD:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

Would you like to know what I feel about these misfits who protest the draft? Probably not, but I'll tell you anyway. These oddballs who think themselves very self-righteous are a bunch of lily-livered cowards. Anyone with brain one knows that Vietnam has gone beyond the talking stage.

I wonder if these dimwits realize that real live men—our neighbors and relatives—are out there spilling their precious blood to save their no good, stinking hides. They should be the ones to go over. Most of them aren't fit, however, for military service. The Army wants men, not pip-squeaks who don't have the nerve to fight for their country.

We really ought to deport them but that would be unfair battle tactics. I'd hate to see even a Communist having to put up with their atrocious behavior. It would take more than a psychiatrist to cure the Commies if the numskulls got to them.

MISS SHERRIE LYNN SCHNEIDER.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

P.S.—I am 15, attending North High. Please excuse my writing, but I am so mad I can't see straight.

(An editor's note following Miss Schneider's letter read—Please excuse us, too. But it appears your vision is pretty good.)

### Senate Committee Opens Hearings on Bank Holding Company Act

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency's Subcommittee on Financial Institutions today began hearings on legislation which would remove the exemptions to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

I congratulate the Senate committee and its distinguished chairman, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, who is also chairman of the full committee, for the work they are beginning on the bills before the committee, including H.R. 7371, which passed the House in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The bill, H.R. 7371, is a good bill and it is supported by the Federal Reserve Board, which has been trying to close the loopholes and exemptions in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 for the last decade. I am hopeful for positive and speedy action by the Senate on this important legislation. I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of my testimony before the committee and also the testimony of the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The statements follow:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES E. BENNETT, OF FLORIDA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 16, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee

in support of H.R. 7371 as it passed the House or of as much of it as you feel can be made law in this session of Congress.

In 1933 banks were prohibited by statute from also doing nonbanking business, the purpose of the statute being to eliminate conflicts of interest and the evils of monopoly. In 1956 bank holding companies were similarly prohibited; but many exemptions were allowed in the new statute. The Federal Reserve Board has recommended ending all of these exemptions and that is what the House bill before you does. It does nothing more.

The report on H.R. 6227, 84th Congress, which became the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, outlines the reasons for requiring bank holding companies to divest themselves of nonbanking businesses, and I would like to quote from that report:

"The reasons underlying the divestment requirement are simple. As a general rule, banks are prohibited from engaging in any other type of enterprise than banking itself. This is because of the danger to the depositors which might result where the bank finds itself, in effect, both the borrower and the lender. It is for this reason, among others, that statutes limiting the investments of banks have been passed by both the Congress and State legislatures.

"The bank holding company is under no such restriction. It may acquire and operate as many nonbanking businesses as it has funds and the disposition to acquire. There are in the country today, as has been pointed out previously, bank holding companies which, in addition to their investments in the stocks of banks, also control the operation of such nonbanking businesses as insurance, manufacture, real estate, mining, and a number of others.

"Whenever a holding company thus controls both banks and nonbanking businesses, it is apparent that the holding company's nonbanking businesses may thereby occupy a preferred position over that of their competitors in obtaining bank credit. It is also apparent that in critical times the holding company which operates nonbanking businesses may be subjected to strong temptation to cause the banks which it controls to make loans to its nonbanking affiliates even though such loans may not, at that time, be entirely justified in the light of current banking standards. In either situation the public interest becomes directly involved.

In the course of the Senate hearings, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin, Jr., testified that:

"Existing provisions of law, originally enacted in the Banking Act of 1933, have proved entirely inadequate to deal with the special problems created by bank holding companies."

Senate Report No. 1095, 84th Congress, 1st session, on this legislation, said of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956: "It represents a compromise."

In signing the act into law, President Eisenhower said: "As a result of the various exemptions and other provisions, the legislation falls short of achieving these objectives. \* \* \* The exemptions and other special provisions will require the further attention of the Congress."

In every annual report to Congress since the passage of the 1956 act the Federal Reserve Board has recommended that the exemptions contained in the 1956 act be eliminated. My amendment to H.R. 7371 accepted by the House on a rollcall vote does exactly that and no more. Let me briefly discuss the exemptions that the House bill, as now amended, would remove.

1. First, of course, it would remove the exemption for the Alfred I. du Pont estate, the original sole purpose of H.R. 7371. This exemption is in general terms, applying to testamentary trusts and to community chests, funds, or foundations for religious,

### Patriotism Rewarded

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Grimes-Kohl Post No. 1031 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Springfield, Ohio, sponsored a Vietnam Veterans' Day as a show of support for the estimated 70 men from the Clark County area who are fighting in Vietnam. The events included a parade through downtown Springfield in the afternoon, followed by a dinner honoring the fighting men and their families.

During the course of the observance Miss Sherrie Lynn Schneider, a sophomore at Springfield's North High School, was rewarded for patriotism as a result of a letter she wrote to the editor of the Springfield Daily News expressing her feelings about anti-Vietnam and draft protestors. Miss Schneider was designated by the VFW Post as "Miss Patriotism of Clark County" and was honored with a special presentation in recognition of this. In addition, she received a \$25 U.S. Government savings bond from the Local No. 402 of the UAW-CIO. This local is made up of 4,000 employees of the Springfield Works of the International Harvester Co.

Such patriotism as expressed in Miss Schneider's letter certainly deserves reward, and the reward accorded it by the union and Grimes-Kohl Post certainly deserves recognition.

March 16, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1519

recently as one of seven finalists, nationwide, to work with various poverty projects in Europe this summer.

But, after much deliberation, she refused the offer—and is convinced her decision was right.

Since January, Mrs. Oleson has worked in the pharmacy department at Tampa General Hospital as an assistant for on-the-job training with Operation ADE (aid to dependent employables).

Because of her meaningful service in the community and her exceptional progress, she was nominated to represent the southeast in a scholarship program designed as an educational experience for participants in anti-poverty programs throughout the United States.

It serves as a recognition to a person who best exemplifies the spirits of self-help and community action so strongly supported by Sargent Shriver both domestically through the Office of Economic Opportunity, and abroad, through the Peace Corps.

Seven recipients, one from each of the geographical regions of the Office of Economic Opportunity, will visit foreign countries for 2 months this summer and have an opportunity to learn how people live, work, and face problems of poverty in other parts of the world as well as how the Peace Corps performs.

"I stayed up all night trying to reach a decision because I felt it was a wonderful opportunity," she said. "But I believe the future in America is in my children and in my home. I know I hated to disappoint a lot of people but I had to put my family first."

Mrs. Oleson has three boys, 18 months, 3, and 4 years old.

She was concerned that two of her children needed medical treatment right now and she also would have been forced to hire a babysitter during the time she was away or have them placed in a nursery.

"My children need their mother very much while they're still so young, and I just couldn't rationalize the idea of leaving them," Mrs. Oleson said.

Mrs. Oleson is one of many women who have had difficulty obtaining employment because she has no marketable skill or it has become outdated.

The program is aimed at teaching women a skill so they can get off the welfare rolls or otherwise earn a sufficient living for their families.

Mrs. Oleson, a native of Tampa, was employed in investigative work out of State, and when she moved back to this area there was very little demand for that type of job.

She has been retrained in a more scientific field and today assists the registered pharmacists at Tampa General in various duties around the department. This job does not include filling prescriptions and other highly trained work.

Mrs. Oleson receives a maintenance allowance of \$30 a week during training and plans are being made to place her in a permanent job when Operation ADE closes in April.

In the poverty programs, the training period varies from 6 to 30 weeks depending on the field.

Two months ago there were 204 people in training and nearly half of that figure had been later employed somewhere in the city.

The program works under the welfare division of the hospital and welfare board of Hillsborough County and operates with a budget of \$846,000.

Operation ADE was begun only last June, but will merge next year with Neighborhood Service Centers, another poverty program in Tampa at a saving in administrative costs.

Director Rudy Spoto, of the hospital and welfare board, said when Operation ADE is

integrated with the larger NSC, within a year there will be three neighborhood agencies in operation in Ybor City, West Tampa, and Plant City.

## Confidence Vote

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, in the eyes of the world, according to the Houston Post, the congressional vote on the Vietnam military operations bill was a vote of confidence on our Vietnam policy.

The policy that was endorsed was one of resolute firmness and prudent restraint—firmness in resisting the Communist effort to take over South Vietnam by force and careful limitation of the amount of force used to resist this effort to what is necessary to keep the Communists from succeeding—while trying by every means to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict in southeast Asia through negotiations.

The view expressed by the Houston Post is one of many on this subject and I include the editorial as a part of the RECORD:

## CONFIDENCE VOTE FOR L.B.J.

In the eyes of the world, the congressional vote on President Johnson's request for an additional \$4.8 billion to pay for military operations in Vietnam during the remainder of the current fiscal year was a vote of confidence on the President's Vietnam policy.

The one-sidedness of the vote by which the money was authorized, 392 to 4 in the House and 93 to 2 in the Senate, reflected the degree of support that the President has in the country as a whole, and it is to be hoped that Communist leaders everywhere, but especially those in Peiping and Hanoi, got the message loud and clear.

The policy issue was much more clear cut resolute firmness and prudent restraint—firmness in resisting the Communist effort to take over South Vietnam by force and careful limitation of the amount of force used to resist this effort to what is necessary to keep the Communists from succeeding—while trying by every means to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict in southeast Asia through negotiations.

The policy issue was much more clear cut in the Senate than in the House, and this was appropriate since debate and criticism have been loudest there. Senator WAYNE MORSE forced a direct vote on presidential policy by offering an amendment to the money authorization bill, which would have repealed the 1964 congressional resolution approving and supporting President Johnson's actions. The effort to repudiate presidential leadership lost by a vote of 92 to 5.

If the men who control the governments in Peiping and Hanoi actually were under any illusion that the American people are deeply divided on the question of the proper policy to be followed in Vietnam, the vote must have come as both a surprise and a shock. It remains to be seen what, if any, effect this will have on their policies and courses of action, but at least the vote helped to offset any encouragement that they may have received as a result of recent senatorial and other criticism of the President's policy.

Even if the Morse amendment had been

approved, the President's power to pursue the policy he is pursuing would not have been affected, and it is doubtful that he would have changed it, because he believes it is the right policy and one that an overwhelming majority of the American people support.

It is true that a few Senators voted to support the President reluctantly and with reservations, but the Communists can derive little satisfaction from this. In the first place, their number is few, and in the second place, their differences with the administration are not fundamental. There is little disagreement on basic objectives.

There are some, of course, who think that President Johnson should spell out in greater specific detail what this country ultimately would settle for in southeast Asia. But this would mean a loss of flexibility and could close the door to some opportunities for a peaceful settlement.

The overriding fact in southeast Asia remains that there can be peace anytime the Communists are willing to abandon their aggression and the use of force in an effort to obtain their objectives. Or, as Secretary of State Dean Rusk put it very succinctly recently, any time they are willing to stop shooting at and killing their neighbors. Or, to put it still differently, any time they are willing to stop being barbarians and show a desire to become members of a civilized world society.

### Wentworth Town Meeting: A Commanding Voice at the Grassroots Reaffirms Stand Against Proposed Livermore Falls, Rumney Dams

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago to the day, I took the floor of the House to argue against a \$50 million project in my district—the high dam at Livermore Falls on the Pemigewasset River—see RECORD of March 16, 1964. This rebutted the charge often made against Members of Congress that they are all for economy except in their own districts.

I pointed how, after detailed study as a member of the Public Works Committee, I found that the objective of flood control in the valley would be accomplished just as well through the construction of small, dry dams on the tributaries of the Pemigewasset. This course would also avoid the heavy economic damage and extensive personal dislocations that would be caused by the construction of a high dam and the impounding of water.

My position was strongly supported by the voters of 10 towns in the Pemigewasset area. Some of those towns have reaffirmed their stand. A resolution unanimously adopted at the last town meeting on March 8 in Wentworth is typical.

This resolution is a commanding voice at the grassroots level. It deserves to be

A1520

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 16, 1966

listened to in Washington. Too much time has already gone by without having this matter settled. The delay renders planning and economic development virtually impossible.

The resolution of the Wentworth town meeting follows:

"Be it resolved that the town of Wentworth, N.H., go on record as being highly opposed to the building of dams at Livermore Falls, on the Pemigewasset River, and at Rumney, on the Baker River, as proposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

"Be it also resolved that the town of Wentworth favors the continuation of the building of the smaller dams in the Baker River Valley as proposed by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service."

I certify that the foregoing resolutions were unanimously adopted by the voters at the town meeting in Wentworth March 8, 1966.

OLIVE M. BELYEA,  
Town Clerk.

## Macomb County Community College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in Macomb County, Mich., are very proud of the rapidly growing community college in our county. It is already an outstanding educational asset for young people in southeastern Michigan.

The south campus of Macomb County Community College was opened just last fall and now has been expanded to include five classroom buildings as well as office and student services structures.

Now plans are underway for the development of the college's center campus. In this connection, I should like to point out that a model of the first unit of MCCC's second campus has been cited for its architecture.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a news release regarding plans for the new college campus. Under unanimous consent I insert the news release from the Macomb County Community College in the Appendix of the RECORD:

## MACOMB COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Cited by national jury as an outstanding school design, a model of the first unit of Macomb County Community College's second campus was chosen to be exhibited at the conference of the American Association of School Administrators, February 12 to 16 in Atlantic City.

The unit, a self-sufficient learning center designed as a component of a large community college complex, earned praise from the AASA school building architectural exhibit jury for "sensitivity to human needs and common interests of students."

According to the screening jury, this sensitivity gives character to the plan and the architecture symbolizes community college education.

Architects for the unit are Wakely-Kushner Associations of St. Clair Shores.

The \$2.4 million project is the first in the development of MCCC's Center Campus on a 220-acre site at Hall Road and Garfield, between Mount Clemens and Utica.

MCCC's South Campus opened in September

of 1965 and was expanded last month to a total of five classroom, office and student services buildings.

The first unit on the Center Campus, one of a series of five subcampuses housing 2,000 students each, is expected to be completed by fall of 1967.

Each learning center, comprised of three buildings, will serve as the major identifying element for the student body. A student will be able to receive all of his general educational instruction in any one of the learning centers. In addition, each learning center will house specialized vocational programs and laboratories.

Each learning center consists of three connected structures: a classroom building, a laboratory building and a student commons building. Emphasis is placed on flexibility of instructional space, providing areas suitable for teaching groups of from 10 to 160 students through the use of movable partitions and varying sizes of rooms.

Science laboratories are organized into units of 24 student stations but may be expanded to accommodate 48 or 72 students. Faculty offices are interspersed among the teaching areas to make the faculty accessible to the students.

The student commons building is designed as a gathering place for the students in each learning center. Here students can study, use reference materials, eat lunch or drink coffee, socialize, view displays, attend a musical presentation, lecture or dramatic work, purchase supplies or pursue other college-related activities.

Plans for the center campus call for two major areas divided by a meadow commons. On the north is the academic core with community-oriented buildings: the campus community center, fine arts center, auditorium, and office-conference center. These buildings will be connected to the learning centers on the south by bridges over the meadow commons.

Ultimate enrollment for the MCCC south and center campuses is expected to reach 30,000, about equally divided between the two.

Historic Church in Ovid, Mich., Gets  
National RecognitionEXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has ever been in western and central Michigan has noticed the fine old building to be found there. Houses, churches and other public buildings dating from the 19th century have attracted national attention as examples of good architecture and high craftsmanship.

A particularly good example is the old First Congregational Church in Ovid, Mich., which I am privileged to represent in the House of Representatives.

Recently, it was announced that the church, now known as the Ovid United Church, has been recorded by the national historic buildings survey project. I wish to bring this to the attention of the Members as recognition of the lovely church in Ovid, and to bring to attention the activities of the national historic buildings survey project.

The project is sponsored by the Library of Congress, the National Park Service, and the American Institute of

Architects. The recording service uncovers buildings of unusual interest or architectural merit, and then takes photographs, makes sketches, writes descriptive material. This material is then filed in the historic American buildings survey archives in the Library of Congress.

The project was founded in 1935, and has had a considerable impact in preserving for future generations our fine American buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the citizens of Ovid deserve congratulation for their effective work in maintaining the Ovid United Church building. As a mark of respect for the activities of the citizens of Ovid and as a recognition of the enduring value of the church as an historic building, a certificate of recognition from the national historic buildings survey project will be sent to Ovid in the coming months.

I am pleased to join the project in honoring the church in Ovid, and I think it appropriate to insert an article on the subject published in the Lansing State Journal:

## OVID CHURCH GETS HISTORICAL LISTING

(By William J. Duchaine)

OVID—The old First Congregational Church, now known as the Main Street Building of the Ovid United Church, has been recorded by the national historic buildings survey project.

Pictures, architectural measurements and history of the nearly century-old edifice will be preserved in the Archives of Congress. It is one of about a score of buildings surveyed in the central Michigan project last summer.

The First Congregational Church of Ovid was organized March 3, 1871. George Fox, grandfather of Harold Beardslee, retired Ovid banker, was the contractor who built the original church and steeple. Fox, a carpenter, owned a sawmill.

The first minister was Rev. William Mulder. Charter members were: C. V. Beebe, M.D., Marie D. Beebe, R. J. Young, Jennie Young, Annie Davis, Henry M. Enos, Charlotte A. Bennett, Susan Beebe, Mary Ray, Mrs. G. D. Sowers, and Miss Jennie Mulock.

The church, built on a hill on High Street, was dedicated in 1872. It was moved to Main Street in 1899, and underwent considerable remodeling the following year. A parlor and porch were added, and an excavation was made for the furnace and dining area.

In 1923, trustees voted to excavate the remainder of the basement to enlarge the area. Harold Beardslee, Fred Green, A. D. Mosser, and C. W. Stone were elected as the committee to organize "work bees." Each man was to give at least 2 hours to the digging project.

This basement is now a large dining area, used for church suppers, Lions Club dinners, receptions, and banquets. The older part of the basement is used as the kitchen.

About 1943, the Congregational and Methodist churches were merged as the Ovid United Church.

## Unemployment Compensation Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, public hearings are currently underway on H.R.



March 16, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1527

haps there might have been 25 years ago, or even 10 years ago, but certainly not today."

An international conference on theological issues raised by the Ecumenical Council will be held on the campus in March. A month later philosophers from around the world, including several from Communist countries, will gather for a congress in Marxist philosophy.

Notre Dame, like most universities, has weak departments. Psychology has suffered there, as at most Catholic schools, from the church's dislike for Freudian analysis. A department was just started this year.

Anthropology, sociology and political science require further bolstering.

Dr. Shuster believes Notre Dame must have a department or a school of education "because education is bound to be one of the great professional fields in the country" in the future.

## GRADUATE PROGRAM

Much of the graduate program needs to be strengthened. Notre Dame now has about 1,000 graduate students in its total enrollment of 7,100 and offers Ph. D.'s in 17 fields. But several standard doctorates are not offered—in modern languages, for instance—and the increasing specialization in science means the university must add many new men.

Philosophy and theology are required courses at Notre Dame, as they are at almost all Catholic schools. Their quality is a source of campus controversy.

The philosophy department has broadened its interests in recent years. In addition to the expected experts in St. Thomas Aquinas, the department now has good men in existentialist thought, or phenomenology, as many Catholics prefer to call it, and in the history of philosophy.

## NO PRAGMATISTS

However, there are no American pragmatists, and the university has hired very few non-Catholic philosophers, except on a visiting professor basis.

"This is a rather sensitive area," said the Reverend Ernan McMullin, an articulate Irish diocesan priest who heads the department. "I would prefer to have a Catholic if he's competent. It's not that I'm intolerably restrictive, but I'd want a man who understands what we're trying to do. He should see that the existence of God, the nature of the human soul, are very important questions. Not that we prescribe the answers, but we do believe the questions are important."

But some at Notre Dame would like to see more non-Catholics added to the permanent philosophy faculty and the curriculum and range of intellectual inquiry opened up even more than it has been.

Even greater ferment exists in theology.

A few years ago the theology department was generally considered to be the weakest in the university, an irony in a great Catholic institution. The courses were traditional and dull—"catechism stuff," critics on the present-day faculty call them.

Recently, however, the voices of younger, more liberal theologians have been heard.

One of these is the Reverend John S. Dunne, author of "The City of the Gods," which George Shuster calls "the best book anybody has written around here in years." A recent series of lectures by Father Dunne on contemporary religious issues drew overflow crowds.

"That never happened around here before," remarked President Hesburgh.

The students came in such large numbers, Father Dunne believes, because "these are the questions that really interest students today. They are questioning the church. They wonder whether they are really in the church any more. They are trying to break away from that old thou shalt not approach and find out about Christian love—how to relate

to other persons, how to break through to autonomy, to real freedom."

In Father Dunne's opinion, no questions should go unasked in theology courses. "When the spirit of inquiry enters into theology, it has an effect on the level of living as well as thought. A kind of quest begins, a search for the meaning of life which is a very real thing for young people now."

Father Dunne continued: "What a Catholic university should do is witness to the fact that the search can go on within the church. One can question everything from within and search for the meaning of life without breaking with the church."

Like others at Notre Dame, Father Dunne thinks that when Notre Dame aimed for the top academically its leaders "might not have realized this would have a big religious dimension," that it would involve "a big break with the static past."

The right to free inquiry has not been fully established for younger theologians who do not have Father Dunne's reputation. Said one:

"Occasionally, if they hear you're saying something mildly heretical in class, they'll mention it. I suppose you could call it a mild warning. That's all—so far, at least."

## INEVITABLE TIDE

These incidents appear to be last, desperate efforts by conservative theologians to stem an inevitable tide, however. Notre Dame will begin a doctoral program in theology next year and soon thereafter plans to set up a research institute in comparative religion, where Protestant, Jewish, and probably agnostic scholars will work with Catholics.

Father Hesburgh said he assumes there are atheists among Notre Dame's students (though 98.5 percent of undergraduates, and 95 percent of all students, claim to be Catholics).

Years ago Notre Dame might have dropped such students, the president said, but not now.

"If a student is going to be an atheist, this is probably as good a place for him as any," said Father Hesburgh. "There are big questions about God—does he exist? Has he had anything to say? Is it relevant to life today? The student should ask these questions. This is the place to work them out."

## Hawaii Second in Nation in 1965 Personal Income Rate of Gain

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii again has clearly demonstrated its economic vitality. In a recent survey conducted by the Business Week magazine, the results showed that Hawaii not only had the second largest rate of gain in personal income for the month of December 1965, but it also rated second highest among the 50 States for the entire year of 1965.

Hawaii's 13.2-percent annual increase was second only to Idaho's 13.9-percent rise. The average rate of gain for the entire United States for 1965 was 8.7 percent.

I am proud to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the article in the March 1, 1966, issue of the Honolulu

Advertiser which contains the Business Week survey results:

## ISLES RATE NO. 2 IN INCOME GAIN

Hawaii had the second largest rate of gain in personal income for 1965 of any of the Nation's 50 States.

The State also had the second biggest rate of growth in the December personal income survey conducted by Business Week magazine.

For the year, Hawaii showed a 13.2-percent increase—right behind Idaho's 13.9-percent rise.

In December, personal income here climbed 17.5 percent over the same month a year ago. The leader for December was North Dakota with a 23-percent jump. Idaho was third at 17.3 percent.

For the United States, the average rate of gain amounted to 8.7 percent for the year, the largest ever recorded by the Business Week survey. And the December gain for the Nation was 9.4 percent.

## Backing Our Men

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, typical of many newspapers, which I have seen, the Houston Post indorses the plan to give our fighting men in Vietnam the hardware they need to do their job.

The Post says:

Surely, there are no thinking Americans who believe we now could withdraw from South Vietnam without doing ourselves irreparable damage.

And it adds that all patriotic Americans would want to supply our men with the material they need.

The editorial sheds light on issues of great concern, and with the belief that this article will be of interest to others, I offer it for the RECORD:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Mar. 2, 1966]

## VIETNAM MONEY BILL VOTED

The Nation had more than ample debate on the administration's \$4.8 billion Vietnam military authorization bill when Congress approved it Tuesday.

The bill in no way is a congressional mandate for increasing the pace of U.S. activity in Vietnam. It merely authorizes payment for military hardware for what we now are doing. Unfortunately, the debate on it, particularly in the Senate, became involved in the hawks versus doves controversy that ballooned from the Vietnam hearings conducted by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The hearing and the delay in passing the money bill undoubtedly have been of much comfort to the Communist leaders in Hanoi and Peking. Some of the things said at the Fulbright hearing by opponents of the U.S. effort to save South Vietnam from coming under the domination of the Hanoi Government very likely will strengthen the conviction of Hanoi that internal strife in this country will result in our withdrawal.

Nothing, of course, is further from the truth. The misguided individuals who speak for withdrawal overlook the fact that we have made a solemn promise to defend the people of South Vietnam against aggression, and that to break this promise would end the trust of our allies in the mutual defense agreements we have with them.

A1528

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 16, 1966

Secretary of State Dean Rusk spoke the blunt truth when he told the Fulbright committee that we are in Vietnam to fight Communist aggression and "because we must make clear that the United States keeps its word whenever it is pledged."

Indeed, the consequence of breaking our word to South Vietnam undoubtedly would have serious repercussions throughout the free world.

As for the military necessity of U.S. participation in Vietnam, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former U.S. Ambassador to that country and certainly a man thoroughly familiar with all aspects of the conflict, told the Fulbright committee that the Communist aggression in South Vietnam is a test of the theory that so-called wars of liberation can be won cheaply and safely. If the Communists were to win in South Vietnam, he added, the war of liberation technique "will be used widely about the world."

More than \$3 billion of the money authorized by the bill would be used for procurement of aircraft. Surely, there are no patriotic Americans who would deny our forces all the planes they need to do their job.

Our pledge to defend South Vietnam was first made in the SEATO treaty of 1954, during the Eisenhower administration. It has been reiterated since then by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Surely, there are no thinking Americans who believe we now could withdraw from South Vietnam without doing ourselves irreparable damage.

**Bravery Cited****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 16, 1966*

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, a young soldier in far off southeast Asia wrote down on a pad of notebook paper,

The cowards die a thousand times, the brave die but once.

That quotation is contained in a letter Pfc. Hiram D. Strickland, of Graham, N.C., wrote to his parents before he was killed in Vietnam.

His letter was reprinted in a recent editorial in the Indianapolis Star. The paper titled the editorial, "He Understood," and said it could make no comment which could add to the eloquence of the letter.

Because I feel sure that many will want to read this moving letter, I place it in the Record at this point:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star,  
Mar. 11, 1966]

HE UNDERSTOOD

Pfc. Hiram D. Strickland, 20 years old, had his own personal feelings about Vietnam.

He put them in a letter to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Donald A. Strickland, of Graham, N.C. It was written in ink on a pad of notebook paper.

Private First Class Strickland, like other young men in combat, had fears he might not come back and he expressed them. He wrote:

"I'm writing this letter as my last one. You've probably already received word that I'm dead and that the Government wishes to express its deepest regret. Believe me, I don't want to die, but I know it was part of my job. I want my country to live for billions and billions of years to come.

"I want it to stand as a light to all people oppressed, and guide them to the same freedom we know. If we can stand and fight for freedom, then I think we have done the job God set down for us. It's up to every American to fight for the freedom we hold so dear. If we don't, the smells of free air could become dark and damp as a prison cell.

"We won't be able to look at ourselves in a mirror, much less at our sons and daughters because we will know we have failed our God, country, and our future generations.

"I can hold my head high because I fought, whether it be in heaven or hell. Besides, the saying goes, 'One more GI from Vietnam, St. Peter, I've served my time in hell.'

"I fought for Sandy, Nell, Gale (his sisters), mom, and dad. But when the twins and Sandy's kids get old enough, they'll probably have to fight, too. Tell them to go proudly and without fear of death, because it is worth keeping the land free.

"I remember a story from Mr. Williams' (Thomas Williams, a teacher at Southern High School in Alamance County) English classes when I was a freshman that said, 'The cowards die a thousand times, the brave die but once.'

"Don't mourn me, mother, for I'm happy I died fighting my country's enemies, and I will live forever in people's minds. I've done what I've always dreamed of. Don't mourn me, for I died a soldier of the United States of America.

"God bless you all and take care. I'll be seeing you in heaven.

"Your loving son and brother, Butch."

The letter was undated. It was never sent. Before Private First Class Strickland could mail it, he was killed by a burst of enemy gunfire which struck him in the head. His parents were notified of his death in a telegram delivered by a taxidriver. The letter was found in a package containing his personal effects.

No comment we can make will add to its eloquence.

**Democracy: What It Means to Me****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 16, 1966*

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to bring to the attention of the House a speech delivered by Mr. Thomas E. Wisniewski of Baltimore, Md., entitled "Democracy: What It Means to Me." Mr. Wisniewski's speech was chosen as the winning Maryland entry in the 1966 Voice of Democracy Contest, sponsored annually by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary.

The speech follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Thomas E. Wisniewski)

Today someone—some soldier—dies in Vietnam, and the scent to touch his nostrils is either that of burnt gunpowder, some rare jungle flower, or the stench of another soldier's coagulating blood. Today someone dies trying to cross the Berlin wall, and the last sight that he sees is broken glass and broken hopes—but not broken people. Today someone enters this country to someday become one of its citizens, and the first sight that he sees, the first sensation he perceives, the first smell to touch his nostrils is that of—is there a word for it?

The first immigrants to this Nation used to be processed at an area on Ellis Island. They would step ashore and fill out the required forms and recite the required oaths and they would fear. They were soon led into a large hall. They were there—together. Here was the world's greatest collection of cowards and heroes. They were cowards because they ran. They were heroes because they ran. Many ran away from something. Many ran toward something. But they did run. They ran away from petty dictators and petty incomes. They ran toward hope. They had a simple faith in a new land—they had a simple belief in democracy. They had a simple hope to live.

To them democracy was not a theory—a government—a philosophy. It was a hope. At times it was naive, ignorant. At times it was brilliant—giving them the answer to the relentless question of "Why did I come?" Democracy is no longer the great experiment; it is the great reality. It is a reality that has no easy explanation, but nevertheless something that can be understood by the most ignorant and something that can be died for by the most cowardly.

To the immigrant democracy offers only one thing. It has no unpronounceable name, but some wish that it never be pronounced. All of democracy and all of the well-intentioned philosophy on democracy revolves about that one oft-repeated and oft-misunderstood word of dignity. Democracy offers man only one right—the right to be himself—the right of his dignity. From this all other rights proceed. But there can be no democracy if people do not want it. Democracy is not something that you put down in law books and point to it and say "There is our democracy; enforce it." It is something whose fragile existence is put into the hands of the individual. The individual decides whether to exercise it. If there is no respect for dignity in an individual's soul—he has no democracy. Democracy can be and is no more than a group of individuals acting together in respect of dignity and integrity—in respect of the individual.

Throughout the world there are those who die for it. May it be said of us that we live for it—that we live for democracy.

To the soldier, to the man on the other side of the Berlin wall, to the immigrant, and to me democracy is not a mere theory or philosophy. It is a simple reality whose essence is the respect, dignity, and integrity of the individual.

**Wars of National Liberation****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. DONALD RUMSFELD**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 28, 1966*

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, at the American Bar Association's House of Delegates meeting in Chicago last month, the association's standing committee on education against communism submitted a report of its programs of education on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. The chairman of this committee is Mr. Morris I. Leibman, a member of President Johnson's Panel on International Affairs and National Security. Among the activities conducted by the committee are summer training institutes for high school social studies and political science teachers, involving instruction on the contrast between com-

March 16, 1966

validity of his tactics, but neither makes a secret of his strategy.

Perhaps you have heard the persuasive and cleverly presented thesis that Communist China is the biggest threat to peace because it is more militant, and that the Soviet Union is less dangerous because it says it wants to live in peaceful coexistence with the West. And perhaps you have also heard the theory that the Soviet Union, as it progresses economically, and as it becomes more and more like the United States, will gradually abandon its revolutionary goals.

But what does "peaceful coexistence" really mean? To us, it means "live and let live." To the Communists it means, in the words of Khrushchev, "a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle" between communism and capitalism. It means expansion of the worldwide revolutionary process with every means short of nuclear war; it means going to the brink, and then retreating when we respond; in plain language, it means warfare, a peculiar kind of warfare which we have never fought. It is the warfare of the "national liberation movement."

What, then, can we expect from wars of national liberation in the future, and what can we do about them?

First, we can almost certainly expect that there will be many more of them in the years ahead. Operating under its umbrella of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union will continue to use its rapidly expanding power to support them whenever and wherever possible. Few of us realize the dimensions of Soviet economic strength, and the strategic implications of that strength.

While the Soviet people are denied the necessities of modern life, huge sums are devoted to subversion, propaganda, espionage, and infiltration.

The Soviets possess the largest airline in the world, and have extensive airline routes to all the underdeveloped countries. Their commercial planes carry agents disguised as technical advisers to Africa, and on the return flights are loaded with students and cultural exchange delegations.

As of January 1 of this year the Soviet Union has one of the largest commercial maritime fleets in the world, and those ships ply the troubled waters of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, delivering cargoes of weapons, crude oil, and revolutionaries.

While the Soviets continue to supply the Vietcong by rail, sea, and air, they look to expanded trade with the West for the purpose of augmenting their military and productive strength. They continue to build up bases of subversion in Cuba and in Zanzibar, and hope to capture other strategically located islands to act as steppingstones in the chain of subversion.

We have said that we welcome economic competition. Do we in fact welcome it? Why should we? Should we promote trade with the Soviet Union when we know that American goods and know-how will be used, directly or indirectly, to support wars of attrition such as that in Vietnam? Are not the Communists asking us to give them the bullets, load the gun, and show them how to aim it?

Finally, our second question: What can we do to stem the tide of Communist "wars of liberation?" What I have presented here is an essentially pessimistic picture of the world. But I would ask you to keep in mind that this discussion has been devoted to a very important question—one that we are hard pressed to answer.

I do owe you a positive alternative, and it can be summed up in a few words: We can win any battle with any adversary if we make the decision to commit our unmatched strength and our own revolutionary ideals

to winning when and where it counts; this will be done if we steer the path of realism and avoid the twin dangers of complacency and unfounded optimism.

Tomorrow, as we celebrate the birthday of our first President, millions of Americans will repeat the pledge of allegiance. We will recite it with pride, because it is the embodiment of the spirit of democracy. Elsewhere in the world, Communists will be taking another pledge, one quite different from our own. This Communist pledge of allegiance might sound something like this:

"I pledge allegiance to the destruction of your society, to the values for which it stands, and to the goals which it seeks to attain;

"I pledge allegiance to your destruction not because I feel hatred of you, but because you represent the decaying forms of the past; not because you have committed a crime against me, but because the system you represent and seek to perpetuate is in itself criminal; not because you want to live in peace and harmony, but because your way of life can never bring peace and harmony;

"I pledge allegiance to the new world order which I will help to create, and if you attempt to stop me, I will crush you."

Clearly, this is a challenge we must be prepared to meet. And if we cannot do it, who can?

### Korea Sends Men

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, South Korea's decision to send 20,000 more troops to Vietnam to reinforce the allies "is a mark of solidarity with not only the United States, but with the United Nations."

This is the editorial opinion of the St. Petersburg Times, which add:

It is truly heartwarming to have a concrete expression of gratitude from one of the nations which the United States has assisted.

Because this editorial is of such timely interest, I am offering it for the Record, where others may read it in its entirety:

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 2, 1966]

#### SOUTH KOREA COMES THROUGH

The vote of the South Korean government to send 20,000 more troops to Vietnam to reinforce the allies—principally U.S. forces—is the best news about that unhappy war in many a day.

This doubling of the South Korean contingent is welcome, of course, just for the addition of that many tough, well-trained fighting men on our side.

But the importance and significance of the move goes far beyond that.

One of the best things about it is that this will ease the Communist charge of "white men fighting yellow men."

Of course, with South Vietnamese troops outnumbering our own by more than 3 to 1, the accusation already was a distorted piece of propaganda. But it is distinctly helpful to have Asiatics from another nation present in such large numbers.

(Incidentally, in answer to the question so often asked as to why we do not accept

Chinese forces under Chiang Kai-shek, which he has offered, this is because that would be almost as great a provocation for Red China's full intervention as if we were to bomb Peking.)

Another point made by the South Korean action is that it is a mark of solidarity with not only the United States, but with the United Nations, which were responsible for South Korea's independence.

It may begin to dawn on some other members of United Nations that this is their fight, too.

Finally, in the world as it is today, it is truly heart-warming to have a concrete expression of gratitude from one of the nations which the United States has assisted. This kind of thanks really counts.

### Congressman William F. Ryan Asks: "What Is Our Franchise To Wage War in the Name of Peace?"

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago today, on January 16, WILLIAM F. RYAN, our colleague from New York, made a major foreign policy address at the Sane dinner. On that occasion the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy presented the annual Eleanor Roosevelt Peace Award to Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN in recognition of his significant efforts in the cause of peace.

During the course of his remarks Congressman RYAN raised a question which has special pertinency at this troubled time. He asked: "What is our franchise to wage war in the name of peace?" He suggested:

America's experience in attempting to bring about peace is a history of efforts to achieve conditions which often reflect our aspirations and not, strictly speaking, our interests.

Congressman RYAN urged that we look beyond Vietnam to China and our relationship to Chinese aspirations and power. He said:

Although we say—for purposes of convenience—that the near collision over the Cuban missiles was the critical impetus for the test ban agreement, we must remember that the lessons learned during long years of negotiations played a significant part in stabilizing the Cuban crisis. A comparable confrontation with China seems highly likely within the next decade; yet we have not initiated an equivalent dialog. In the Far East our real and attainable interests lie in heading off a war with China—in meeting the threat of famine, chaos, and civil breakdown in India—not in duplicating nature's disasters.

Mr. Speaker, these considerations are of the utmost importance, now, when critical decisions are still being made about our policy in the Far East. Congressman RYAN's speech is a valuable contribution to the debate that is taking place, and I want to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

March 16, 1966

A1529

munism and liberty under law. Eighteen colleges and universities have cooperated in these training programs. Committee publications are distributed to schools, professional, educational, and trade associations, as well as religious and civic organizations and the press. One of the committee's publications, a teachers' syllabus, "Democracy Confronts Communism in World Affairs," was purchased by the Department of State for distribution to U.S. embassies and consulates abroad. At the invitation of State and local bar associations and other organizations, seminars on communism and the free society are conducted.

At the Chicago meeting, briefings were held on a variety of subjects. One of the speakers was Dr. Richard V. Allen, chairman of the study program on communism at the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Because of the continuing nationwide discussion of the meaning of the term "wars of national liberation," I am inserting Dr. Allen's statement made at the February 21, 1966, special briefing session.

Mr. Speaker, our country is deeply engaged in Vietnam today, and our conduct in that part of the globe will surely affect our future and the future of the entire free world. The people of the United States have the right to be fully informed on our involvement in Vietnam, what it means and what it entails. To its credit, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by its public Vietnam hearings, has made a contribution to the national dialogue. I believe that a full discussion of all viewpoints on all aspects of the problems facing the world is valuable.

Dr. Allen's statement follows:

WARS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION  
(Address by Richard V. Allen)

Within the last year we have all heard the term "wars of national liberation" used with increasing frequency. Our newspapers, magazines, our television screens, the airwaves, the documents of Congress, and the speeches of administration spokesmen all have been filled with news concerning the so-called wars of national liberation.

What, precisely, is a war of national liberation?

Is it the expression of the legitimate interests of people who are on the march to democracy?

Is it a kind of "American Revolution" designed to free the citizens of countries which are ruled by despots, tyrants, and assorted corrupt powerseekers?

And now for the most important question: Is it the kind of war which Americans understand, and is it the kind of war which we are prepared to deal with effectively?

I believe the answer to each question is "No." And why? Precisely because a war of national liberation is a war waged by Communists for the express purpose of subverting, paralyzing, and ultimately overthrowing non-Communist governments everywhere. It is a form of warfare which the Communists have sought to legitimize; it is a form of warfare which they claim is sweeping the world; and is a form of warfare which we, the greatest and most powerful nation on earth, are ill-equipped and uninclined to deal with.

Let us turn back the clock 10 years, and let us imagine that we are assembled in this room in February 1956. Let us further imagine that there is a speaker on this plat-

form who is telling you a fantastic tale. His story goes something like this:

"Today we are faced with a threat to our way of life unmatched by any threat in our entire history. We have failed to gain an appreciation of the times in which we live. Three years ago, when the Soviet dictator, Stalin, died, we took comfort in the pronouncement that the new Communist leadership would practice a policy of peaceful coexistence with the West. But, our speaker goes on to say, do not be fooled by such promises; actions speak louder than words, and when the Communists finally give up their drive for worldwide revolution, we will know it, for they will have begun to practice what they have preached. I, for one, do not believe that they have given up; I believe that they are trying to throw us off guard, that they are seeking to deceive us until they can muster their forces for a new assault on the free world, and that if we let ourselves be fooled again, we may one day wake up and find them on our doorsteps."

And then our imaginary speaker makes a fantastic, and some would say, an insane prediction:

"Because I believe that the Communists have not given up, I will predict tonight that within 10 years there will be an armed Communist camp on an island within a hundred miles of our shores; that the Communists will try to place weapons of mass destruction on that island; and that that island will serve as a staging base for the subversion of the entire Southern Hemisphere. I will further predict that the Communists will try to take advantage of the instability and chaos in Africa as the colonial powers of Belgium, France, and Great Britain withdraw their presence there; and I shall predict that within 10 years, the United States will have a quarter of a million men in the steaming jungles of southeast Asia, and that our boys will be losing their lives to protect an obscure and distant nation located there."

With that our speaker concludes his presentation, and is greeted by a mixture of polite applause and muffled laughter. And then, a voice from the back of the room cries out: "Who invited that lunatic to tell us a fairytale?"

But as our imaginary speaker rests his case, there is a very real man speaking in a hall 5,000 miles away. He has just finished a 3-hour condemnation of his predecessor, the leader of a mighty country. He has proclaimed that war is no longer inevitable, and that his country seeks to live in harmony with the rest of the world. He promised peace, friendship, and social progress.

The man was, of course, Nikita Khrushchev; the predecessor whom he had condemned was Stalin, and the peace which he had promised was the kind which only communism could bring to the world; it was the peace of total domination. In February 1956 Nikita Khrushchev pledged that kind of peace by combining the power of the Soviet Union and the rest of the Communist bloc with the "revolutionary forces of the national liberation movement."

So, here we are, 10 years later. Our imaginary speaker is gone, and so is Khrushchev. In the place of the imaginary speaker stands a bespectacled, somewhat overweight young man; in the place of Khrushchev stands not one, but two men, both bespectacled and both overweight. Our Chicago speaker is not given to making rash predictions, so he will not say that, within 10 years the U.S. possession of Puerto Rico will be subjected to a war of national liberation.

He will not say that strategically located countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America—now heavily infiltrated by Communists—may pass into the Communist orbit within a few years. He leaves that to his friends in Moscow and Peking, and to the representatives of 77 other Communist Par-

ties which met just 40 days ago at the Havana Tricontinental Conference. At Havana the Communist Parties of the world proclaimed that:

"We are deeply in sympathy with the courageous struggle waged by the peoples of Latin America. We express our fraternal solidarity with the armed struggle being waged by the Venezuelan, Peruvian, Colombian, and Guatemalan patriots for freedom against the stooges of imperialism. We are in solidarity with the struggle being waged by the people of Puerto Rico, which remains under the occupation of North American imperialism."

This statement along with the general declarations emanating from that Tricontinental Conference amount to nothing more than a new unilateral declaration of war upon the United States, its allies, and all non-Communist governments in the world.

Once again the Communists have publicly declared, for all the world to hear, that they are embarking on a new offensive against the free world. They have said that conditions are now ripe for the final push, and that they intend to utilize every weapon in their impressive arsenal of conflict techniques. They have promised that they will not give up the struggle against us, and that with the passage of time both our will to resist and our capability to resist will be weakened by the pressures of their "national liberation movement."

They know that the most cherished desire of the American people and of free people everywhere is the establishment of a just and lasting peace. They have dedicated themselves to denying us that peace, saying that our kind of peace is aggression. In short, they will not let us alone until we have given in, and they will challenge us to prove that they are wrong.

To put it another way: the Communists are convinced that we are slowly weakening, and that they are steadily gaining strength; that our prestige and honor are slipping away, and that theirs is rapidly increasing; that our will to resist and our willingness to get involved are ebbing away, and that theirs is reaching its peak; that we are losing, and they are winning.

Are they, in fact, winning? And are we losing? From the point of view of the Communist leaders in Moscow and Peking there is little cause for pessimism. When they compare the map of 1920 with the map of 1966, should they feel that they are losing? From humble beginnings in the exile capitals of the world some 50 years ago they have created an empire which controls a billion people. Putting ourselves in their shoes we might ask, why should we give up if our strategy has paid consecutive dividends?

But, you may argue, the Communist world is now divided; Moscow and Peking are at each other's throats, and it is likely that they will soon be locked in a prolonged and bloody war. Can't we take some comfort from the fact that the Communists, like thieves, are falling out among themselves? No informed citizen, much less the prudent specialist who makes a career of studying the Communist movement, would deny that the two Communist giants are engaged in an important and decisive debate.

But over what are they debating; strategy or tactics? Over whether, or how to continue the attack against what they call imperialism? Over means or ends? On this point of crucial importance we simply cannot afford to make a mistake; for if we do, it will be a profoundly dangerous, perhaps fatal, mistake.

At the present time, the Soviet Union and Communist China are waging a battle of words on one level, and are competing vigorously at another. What they are competing for is not each other's territory, but for the leadership of the international Communist movement. Each is trying to prove the